

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

MERCEDES-BENZ USA, LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

NEO WIRELESS, LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case IPR2023-00079
U.S. Patent No. 10,965,512

**PETITIONER'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF
PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR JOINDER**

Filed on behalf of Petitioner:
Celine Jimenez Crowson (Reg. No. 40,357)
Joseph J. Raffetto (Reg. No. 66,218)
Scott Hughes (Reg. No. 68,385)
Helen Y. Trac (Reg. No. 62,250)
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP
555 13th Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202.637.5600
Facsimile: 202.637.5710

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

<i>Everlight Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. Document Sec. Sys., Inc.</i> , No. IPR2018-01225 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 27, 2018).....	3
<i>Mercedes-Benz Grp. AG v. Arigna Tech. Ltd.</i> , No. IPR2022-00776 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 8, 2022).....	2
<i>Microsoft Corp. v. Koninklijke Philips N.V.</i> , No. IPR2017-01754 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 29, 2017).....	3
<i>Pfizer Inc. v. Sanofi-Aventis Deutschland GmbH</i> , No. IPR2019-00981 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 15, 2019).....	3
<i>Qualcomm Inc. v. DSS Tech. Mgmt., Inc.</i> , No. IPR2016-01314 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 29, 2016).....	3

Statutes

35 U.S.C. § 315(c)	1
--------------------------	---

Rules

37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b)	1
-----------------------------	---

Neo Wireless, LLC (“Patent Owner”) filed a Patent Owner’s Response to Petitioner’s Motion For Joinder,¹ in which it does not oppose but instead seeks multiple unnecessary conditions on such joinder. Paper 7 (“Response”). Instead of a substantive opposition, Patent Owner argues that joinder should only be granted on the following conditions: 1) Petitioner should be denied *any* right to participate in the joined proceeding, 2) Petitioner’s exhibits, including its expert declaration, should be excluded from the record, and 3) if joinder is granted, Volkswagen should be shown to have accepted Petitioner’s role in the proceeding. For the reasons given herein and in Petitioner’s Motion for Joinder, Paper 3 (“Motion”), if the Volkswagen IPR is instituted, Petitioner’s Motion for Joinder should be granted, without imposing Patent’s Owner’s unnecessary conditions.

First, the Response fails to appropriately consider Petitioner’s express statements that it, if joined, would take an inactive understudy role. Petitioner

¹ Petitioner respectively moved pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 315(c) and 37 C.F.R. § 42.122(b) for joinder with any *inter partes* review that is instituted as to U.S. Patent No. 10,965,512 (the “’512 patent”) in *Volkswagen Group of America, Inc. v. Neo Wireless, LLC*, No. IPR2022-01539 (the “Volkswagen IPR”). Should the Volkswagen IPR not be instituted, Petitioner’s motion for joinder would be moot and its petition decided on its merits.

being joined as an inactive understudy would not present any additional burden on the Patent Owner. As described in Petitioner’s Motion, the grounds presented here by Petitioner are the same as the grounds presented in the Volkswagen IPR, Motion at 6–7, and Petitioner will have no substantive role in that proceeding unless the petitioner in the Volkswagen IPR ceases its own participation. *See* Motion at 78.

Second, Patent Owner’s supposed “further conditions,” Response at 2–7, are essentially duplicative of the restrictions that Petitioner already proposes on its participation in the Volkswagen IPR and are thus unnecessary. Petitioner’s Motion makes clear that, if joined, it will not raise new grounds or introduce its own arguments or discovery and that it will not submit any filing unless the filing solely involves Petitioner. These restrictions are adequate to eliminate the chance of duplicative briefing and any additional burden in the Volkswagen IPR. *See, e.g., Mercedes-Benz Grp. AG v. Arigna Tech. Ltd.*, No. IPR2022-00776, Paper No. 8, 11 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 8, 2022).

And although Patent Owner urges that Petitioner be compelled to withdraw the declaration of Mr. McNeal, that would be inappropriate and premature at this stage. The cases relied upon by Patent Owner involve situations where joining petitioners sought to introduce expert declarations with *new* or additional arguments or otherwise did not agree to rely solely on the declaration of first petitioner’s expert,

and are inapplicable here. Response at 7. The Board regularly permits joinder of petitioners who relied on different declarants, when, as is the case here, the joining petitioner's expert presents the same opinions as the earlier-filed IPR. *See, e.g., Everlight Elecs. Co., Ltd. v. Document Sec. Sys., Inc.*, No. IPR2018-01225, Paper 14, at 5-9 (P.T.A.B. Sept. 27, 2018); *see also Pfizer Inc. v. Sanofi-Aventis Deutschland GmbH*, No. IPR2019-00981, Paper 12, at 4 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 15, 2019); *Microsoft Corp. v. Koninklijke Philips N.V.*, No. IPR2017-01754, Paper 16, at 6 (P.T.A.B. Nov. 29, 2017); *Qualcomm Inc. v. DSS Tech. Mgmt., Inc.*, No. IPR2016-01314, Paper 8, at 2 n.1, 3 (P.T.A.B. Aug. 29, 2016). Consistent with such cases, Petitioner agrees to rely entirely on, and be bound by, the declaration and deposition of Dr. Paul Min in the Volkswagen IPR, assuming that the Volkswagen IPR petitioner does not terminate its IPR before Dr. Min is deposed. *See Everlight Elecs.*, No. IPR2018-01225, Paper 14, at 6. And if the Volkswagen Petitioner terminates its IPR before Dr. Min is deposed, Petitioner will rely on Mr. McNeal's substantively identical declaration and the Patent Owner can depose Mr. McNeal. Joinder accordingly presents no risk of duplicative declarations, depositions, or other evidence.

Third, Patent Owner's demands for agreement as to Petitioner's role from the petitioner in the Volkswagen IPR are a red herring. Petitioner's acceptance of an understudy role places numerous restrictions on *Petitioner* that the Volkswagen IPR

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.